

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Thomas C. Jacobi Allen,)	Case No. 3:24-cv-03203-JDA
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	OPINION AND ORDER
)	
United States of America,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's pro se Complaint [Doc. 1], a Report and Recommendation ("Report") of the Magistrate Judge [Doc. 11], and four motions filed by Plaintiff [Docs. 14; 15; 16; 21]. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett for pre-trial proceedings.

On June 18, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the case be summarily dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. [Doc. 11.] The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. [*Id.* at 4.] Plaintiff did not file objections and the time to do so has lapsed.¹

¹ Plaintiff filed four motions in this case after the Magistrate Judge issued the Report. [Docs. 14; 15; 16; 21.] Additionally, Plaintiff filed what he calls both a motion and a notice of appeal. [Doc. 17.] However, none of these filings specifically object to or even mention the Report's recommendation that the case be summarily dismissed, and as such, none of them constitutes objections to the Report.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

The Court has reviewed the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge for clear error.² Having done so, the Court accepts the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and incorporates it by reference. Accordingly, this action is summarily DISMISSED without prejudice and without issuance and service of process, and Plaintiff’s motions [Docs. 14; 15; 16; 21] are DENIED.³

² To the extent Plaintiff’s motion/notice of appeal is an attempt to appeal and/or object to the Report, the document fails to provide any argument regarding a specific objection. [Doc. 17.] Accordingly, the Court has reviewed the Report for clear error.

³ Plaintiff’s motions are for an emergency cash reward settlement, paper check, or digital card [Doc. 14]; for discovery [Doc. 15]; and for default judgment [Docs. 16; 21]. However, as stated, the Report recommends that this case be summarily dismissed without issuance and service of process. As such, Plaintiff is not entitled to a settlement,

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Jacquelyn D. Austin
United States District Judge

July 31, 2024
Columbia, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

discovery, or default judgment, as service of process has never been authorized in this case.